DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 362 431 SO 023 160

AUTHOR Dahawy, Bayoumi M.
TITLE In-Service Education within Schools: A Comparative Perspective.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Comparative Education; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Professional Training; School Role; *Teacher Centers
IDENTIFIERS Egypt; *United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

This paper prepared in the United States by a visiting faculty member of the Suez Canal University in Egypt, presents a comparative study that finds that school-based in-service training sessions, in which teachers learn within their own teaching environments, do much to encourage more teachers to adopt a more positive attitude to the revitalization of teaching techniques. The research looked at and compared school-based in-service education and teachers' centers in the United Kingdom and the United States. Five specific questions were used to guide the research: (1) What is the definition of in-service education and why is it important? (2) How can the teacher education level be improved through in-service education? (3) How can the status of the teaching profession be raised? (4) To what extent can the schools play a vital role in in-service education? and (5) To what extent can Egyptian schools benefit from the experiences of English and U.S. schools? (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 362 431

In-Service Education Within Schools: A Comparative Perspective

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
BAYOUMI M. DAHAWY
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 023 140

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In-Service Education Within Schools: A Comparative Perspective

By
Bayoumi M. Dahawy
Faculty of Education - Suez Canal University
Ismailia - Egypt
Visiting Scholar, Institute for International Studies in Education,
School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, PA 15260
(January to June 1990)

ABSTRACT

There is a great need for better programs of in-service education, according to the rapidly changing culture and its implications for curriculum change, the continuing increase in pupil involvements and numbers of teachers, the need for improved school leadership and the continuous additions to our knowledge in general and about children and youth and the learning process in particular. Therefore, school based in-service training sessions learning within one's own teaching environment would do much to help encourage more teachers to adopt a more positive attitude to regearing and revitalizing teaching techniques.

Problem and Methodology:

1. What is the definition of in-service education and why is it important?
2. How can the teacher education level be improved through in-service education?
3. How to raise the status of teaching profession?
4. To what extent can school play a vital role in in-service education?
5. To what extent can Egyptian schools benefit from English and American schools?

The Comparative Study of G. Bereday with its four steps will be applied in this study.

Some of the Main Results:

1. The value and importance of Egyptian teachers' tasks toward their profession.
2. The advantages of the over-population of the teaching forces for in-service education.
3. The use of retirees' expertice as advantages for in-service education.
4. The closed relationships between the teachers and other societal agencies.

In-Service Education Within Schools: A Comparative Perspective[1]

By
Bayoumi M. Dahawy
Suez Canal University
Ismailia-Egypt

Visiting Scholar, Institute for International Studies in Education, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, PA 15260 (January to June 1990)

Introduction

According to Tomorrow's Teachers, the Holmes Group asks that the education of teachers become more solid intellectually; that distinctions between beginners and more competent teachers be recognized, entrance standards into the profession be raised, and the education of teachers be undertaken through active cooperation among universities and schools. Above all, in their schools and classrooms, teachers must exercise a greater degree of autonomy and professional leadership than they do now.[2]

However, school is increasingly being seen in countries as a major initiator of and focus for in-service education of teachers. P. Perry in his final conclusions of the Stockholm Conference on Strategies for School-Focused support structure for teacher in change and innovation claimed that: "The case has been cogently made that to ensure true implementation of change...we must work with teachers in the place and in the situation where change is taking place. The case is made with equal cogency that the school building is the context in which all needs at all levels of the system ultimately come together"...He also offered a definition: "School-focused training is all the strategies employed by trainers and teachers in partnership to direct training programs in such a way as to meet the identified needs of the school and to raise the standards of teaching and learning in the classroom."[3]

Therefore, the teacher is looked upon as one of the basic constituents of the educational system, and must, therefore, be placed in focus when considering the development and betterment of the educational service being rendered to students in the school. Inspired by this fact, the Egyptian government calls for re-emphasizing the attention paid to the preparation and the professional career of the teacher, i.e., the importance to be lent not only to pre-service education programs, but to the continued in-service training programs for the development of teachers' professional competence.[4]

Problem and Methodology

In line with the goals and objectives of National Development and to the social, cultural, and educational needs of the population, the goals of education are the following:

1. Planning a sound and stable educational policy for the education of teachers with the aim of meeting the country's needs and achieving the desired stability for teachers.

2. Responding to the requirements of new communities, meeting the basic need of the citizens there, achieving better productive efficiency standards and applying sophisticated technology.

3. Achieving life-long continuing education through extending the scope of education, multiplying its institutions and attempting to remove barriers between formal and non-formal education, while at the same time, providing citizens with a variety of developing educational opportunities.[5] Therefore, one of the main features of years three and four of the Five-Year Educational Plan (1984-85 and 1985-86) was that: upgrading the academic and professional performance level of teachers through:

a. Re-considering the pre-service education programs, and

b. Continuing an in-service development of teachers' professional competence.[6]

Over and above, the major persisting problems the Egyptian educational system has been suffering from were identified through an extensive analysis of the actual educational practices all over the country. The most crucial problems had to do with financial resources, quality of education, lack of scientific planning, outdated curriculum, and poor teacher education. These problems, as well as some others, have contributed to magnify the discrepancy between the outputs of the educational system and the societal, economic, and cultural needs of the country.[7]

To overcome these shortcomings in the system of education in Egypt, deep studies should be held, taking into consideration the different societal aspects from different dimensions.

The shortcoming of pre-service education for teachers has been examined in many interesting studies on the individual level[8] as well as on the group level.[9] Despite all of these efforts, there still needs to be more examination to cope with the changes that occur within and without a society.

The main interest of this study is to deal with the second and major part of teacher education, in-service education, mainly through schools' efforts at different level of schooling, with cooperation with other related agencies and interested institutions, such as, educational directorates and university colleges.

<u>The Study's Assumptions and Questions</u>:

To address this problem, this study planned to examine these hypothesis:

1. The level of teacher education might improve if in-service education programs take place within the school environment.

2. Teachers might achieve some of their professional needs if they take responsibility of up-raising their qualifications.

3. Teachers may achieve 1 and 2 if these schools become centers of in-service education, and have free and regular time for attendance.

These hypotheses might transfer to these questions:

1. What is the definition of in-service education and why is it important?

2. How can the teacher level of education be improved through in-service education programs?

3. How can the status of the teaching profession be raised?

4. To what extent can school play a vital role in organizing and administrating the in-service education programs?

5. To what extent can Egyptian schools, under their current conditions, benefit from experiences in other societies?

To investigate these hypothesis and to answer these questions, this study would like to follow one of the comparative methodological approaches, George Bereday's in particular.[10] This approach will suit this study for two reasons. The first because of its nature as a case study, which is dealing with one major society experience (U.S.A.). The second because of its nature as a comparative study, dealing with three different societies (U.S.A., U.K., and Egypt).

The main steps of this comparative education approach are:

a. Description

b. Interpretation

c. Juxtaposition

d. Comparison

These four steps and the background of the approach had been experimented clearly in full detail by the author in a previous study.[11] Therefore, this paper will not go forward.

In the following pages, the study tries to test and answer its hypotheses and questions.

The Definition of In-Service Education

In-service education is usually distinguished from pre-service education simply by the time and sequence. It is not uncommon for in-service education to be confused with supervision. This is understandable since the term supervision itself is used with a great variety of meaning. A distinction, however, needs to be drawn.

The range of supervision activities tends to be rather broad, including public relations, instructional materials development, curriculum development, and evaluation of instruction. In-service education on the other hand, is concerned with much more limited tasks, namely the development of instructional staff members as professional practitioners, in such ways as to have a reasonably direct impact upon the quality of instruction offered in the school or college. It is the emphasis upon instruction which separates supervision from many other facets of the school operation, but it is the emphasis on the development of instructional staff members as practitioners which distinguishes in-service education from the larger function of instructional supervision.

It's important, also, to distinguish programmatic efforts at staff improvement from individual efforts for professional growth. This is not intended to denigrate the importance of individual efforts, but to reflect an emphasis on the crucial importance of planned programs if in-service needs are to be met. Broadly defined, in-service education must include all activities aimed at the improvement of professional staff members.[12]

However, the meaning and function of in-service education are:

- In-service education is a process for change;
- Changes through in-service education take place in an organizational context;
- In-service education is a process for planned change; and
- In-service education is one of several organizational changes and takes place through personal development.[13]

It is seen clearly, that in-service education is one of several means for bringing about personal changes. Personal change is only one of the several classes of planned change in organizations. Changes may be unplanned as well as planned, and formal organizations such as schools and educational directorates have both maintenance and change operations. In-service education, then, is defined as being for both change and maintenance, planned and goal directed, rather than unplanned.

It should be apparent from the foregoing analysis that in-service education is one of several sources of change in organizations. A major source of change comes through the use of authority. Some should suggest that authority is an overused and somewhat ineffective means of getting change, but the fact remains that all change in the organization must take into account authority relations. Furthermore, some changes can be brought about by use of authority alone. Changes in goals that may change the organization in dramatic ways are clearly functions of authority.

A final source of change, and the one which involves in-service education most directly, is that of personal development. Since individuals carry out the tasks of the organization, all organizational changes depend to some extent on the willingness and ability of people to change their ways of doing things.

In an organization such as a school, where members aspire to professional autonomy and status, personal development is seen as everybody's job. Members may feel a responsibility to meet their own needs either individually or in small voluntary groups.[14]

The Importance of In-Service Education

The reasons for in-service education hardly need recounting for they have been widely described in the literature for more than thirty years. A brief review brings to mind several points. Fundamentally, in-service education programs are important for the following reasons:

1. Pre-service preparation of professional staff members is rarely ideal and may be primarily an introduction to the field rather than professional preparation as such.

2. Social and educational change makes current professional practice obsolete or relatively ineffective in a very short period of time. This applies to methods and techniques, tools and substantive knowledge itself.

3. Coordination and articulation of instructional practices require changes in people. Even when each instructional staff member is functioning at a highly professional level, employing an optimum number of the most effective practices, such an instructional program might still be relatively uncoordinated from subject to subject and poorly articulated from year to year.

4. Other factors argue for in-service education activities of rather diverse kinds. Morale can be stimulated and maintained through in-service education, and is a contribution to instruction in itself, even if instructional improvement of any dynamic kind does not occur.[15]

Moreover, Stephen Corey argues that there is a great need for a better programs of in-service education, according to the rapidly changing culture and its implication for curriculum change, the continuing increase in pupil enrollments and numbers of teachers, the need for improved school leadership, the continuous additions to our knowledge in general and particularly our knowledge about children and youth and the learning process. All, in accumulation, mean that professional school people need to work continuously to keep abreast of what they must know and must be able to do. They need help in the form of carefully planned and creative programs of in-service education.[16]

He also adds that the modern concept of in-service education, with its heavy emphasis upon cooperative problem-solving, is in considerable degree a result of changes in our ideas about human motivation and the way learning occurs within an institutional setting. In-service education of school personnel has always had as its objective the improvement of professional behavior.[17]

In the same volume, C. G. Hass stated that "the major reason for in-service education is to promote the continuous improvement of the total professional staff of the school system. All teachers, administrators, and supervisors must constantly study in order to keep up with advances in subject matter and in the theory and practice of teaching. Continuous in-service education is needed to keep the profession abreast of new knowledge and to realize creative abilities.

There are a number of facts and factors which make clear the need for in-service education, such as

a. the continuing cultural and social changes which create a need for curriculum change,

b. pre-service education cannot adequately prepare members of the public school professional staff for their responsibilities,

c. increase in pupil enrollment,

d. the present and continuing increase in the number of teachers,

e. the present and continuing shortage of adequately prepared teachers,

f. the present and continuing need for improved school leaders,

g the maintenance of familiarity with new knowledge and subject matter, and

h. the increased skill in providing for the individual differences among pupils.[18]

Furthermore, J.C. Parker, in his Guidelines For In-Service Education, presented an operational principle or a criterion which may consistently direct or guide individual and group action in planning, organizing, and conducting in-service education activities. These are:

1. People work as individuals and as members of groups on problems that are significant to them.

2. The same people who work on problems formulate goals and plan how they will work.

3. Many opportunities are developed for people to relate themselves to each other.

4. Continuous attention is given to individual and to group problem-solving processes.

5. Atmosphere is created that is conducive to building mutual respect, support, permissiveness, and creativeness.

6. Multiple and rich resources are made available and are used.

7. The simplest possible means are developed to move through decisions to actions.

8. Constant encouragements are present to test and to try ideas and plans in real situations.

9. Appraisal is made an integral part of in-service activities.

10. Continuous attention is given to the interrelationship of different groups.

11. The facts of individual differences among members of each group are accepted and civilized.

12. Activities are related to pertinent aspects of the current educational, cultural, political, and economic scenes.[19]

In the following pages, we will examine the second, the third, and the fourth questions which have been raised by this study in order to identify the current problem. This would be done through the first and second steps of George Bereday's approach of Comparative Education, mainly the area study which include the description and interpretation steps.

To put those two steps into practice, a description of the issue of in-service education in the United Kingdom and its specific initial conditions will be addressed. Following that, the case of in-service education in the United States of America through the same procedures will be examined.

School-Based In-Service Education in the United Kingdom

The school is increasingly being seen in countries as a major initiator of and focus for In-Service Education of Teachers (INSET). Perry (1977), in his final conclusions of the Stockholm Conference on strategies for school-focused support structure for teacher in change and innovation, claimed that "the case has been cogently made that to ensure true implementation of change...we must work with teachers in the place and in the situation where change is taking place. The case is made with equal cogency that the school building is the context in which all needs at all levels of the system ultimately come together." He also offered a definition: "School focused training is all the strategies employed by trainers and teachers in

partnership to direct training programs in such a way as to meet the identified needs of the school, and to raise the standards of teaching and learning in the classroom."[20]

In the United Kingdom, a nationally distributed pamphlet suggested several INSET methods of a less conventional kind:

1. A home economics teacher spends a day in another school to find out about a new child-care course.

2. Two deputy heads in very different primary schools exchange jobs for one week to broaden their experience.

3. A large comprehensive school timetable frees staff for one week each year to work on materials preparation with the resource center coordinator.

4. Two colleagues in the same school systematically observe each other teaching over a term and discuss their observations after each session.

5. A group of comprehensive school staff developing a new integrated-studies curriculum invites a Teachers' Center warden to coordinate a term long school based course involving outside speakers.

6. A college of education offers a week-long course for primary schools for four weeks in succession. Each of four members of staff attend in turn, thus having a similar experience. College staff follow up by visiting the schools.

7. Two Local Education Authority (LEA) advisors offer a school-based course of eight weekly sessions on primary math. They spend from 3-3.45 working with teachers in their classrooms and from 4-5.30 in follow up workshop/discussion sessions.

8. A university award-bearing course for a group of staff from the same school includes a substantial school-based component.

9. A school runs a conference on "Going Comprehensive" which begins on Friday morning, in school time, and ends on Saturday afternoon. Outside speakers include a chief advisor, a comprehensive head and a university lecturer. As a result, several working parties run throughout the following year."[21]

However, secondary schools in several countries have designated a senior member of staff as the equivalent of a professional tutor. In the United Kingdom, for instance, several local education authorities have encouraged schools to develop their own in-service policies and programs and to appoint a professional tutor with responsibilities for initial induction

and in-service training,[22] although in most schools these are split between two or more experienced staff. Thus, in one secondary school, a deputy head co-ordinates the professional development program and concentrates on that aspect aimed at experienced teachers. He is assisted by a less senior colleague who looks after probationary teachers and student teachers. The school's professional development committee is chaired by the deputy head, with the tutor acting as secretary, and the membership is made up of teacher representatives, the LEA's general advisor for the school, and the liaison tutor from a college of education.[23] Therefore, the British governmental pamphlet already referred to the Department of Education and Science to recommended schools in England and Wales to devise an INSET program focused on the needs of individual teachers, functional groups (e.g. departmental terms) and the whole school staff.[24]

Perhaps the simplest way to summarize and clarify the nature of school focused INSET is to compare and contrast it with the two most common alternatives: the long course and the short course.

The long course will include the in-service B. Ed., and the Advanced Diploma in Education and M. Ed. Characteristically such courses would:

a. Last up to three years;

b. Be located off the school site at a university or college of higher education;

c. Be staffed by university or college lecture who would also initiate and design them;

d. Be attended by individual teachers from different schools;

e. Be aimed at meeting the professional and, to some extent, the personal educational needs of individual teachers;

f. Take place away from the teachers' classrooms and schools and thus in an off-the-job or course-embedded context;

g. Concentrate on conveying knowledge about theory, research and subject discipline;

h. Use teaching methods like lectures, tutorials and discussion groups;

i. Normally result in an academic award or accreditation which would often be an aid to a salary increase or promotion;

j. Rarely involve any follow up contacts at the end of the course; and

k. Rarely be evaluated by the providing agency for impact upon teaching performance or school change.[25]

The short courses in the United Kingdom include evening or weekend conferences or courses of, say, ten weekly two-hour sessions on topics like Primary Science, School Management, and In-School Evaluation. Characteristically, such courses would

a. Last for no more than one term of ten weeks;

b. Be located mainly, but not exclusively, off the school site at a teachers' center, college of higher education or university;

c. Be staffed mainly by staff from this external center who would normally initiate and design the course;

d. Be attended mainly by individual teachers from different schools, but sometimes by pairs or groups from the same school;

e. Be aimed at meeting the vocational development needs of individual teachers in the hope that this would improve their work in school;

f. Take place away from the teachers' classrooms and schools and thus in an off-the-job and course embedded context;

g. Concentrate on practical knowledge and skills but at a fairly high level of generality;

h. Use teaching methods like workshops, simulations and films as well as lectures and discussion groups;

i. Sometimes lead to an accreditation which may be recognized for promotion (but not salary) purposes;

j. Sometimes involve follow-up visits by the course staff to the teachers in their schools; and

k. Sometimes be informally evaluated by the providing agency for impact upon teaching performance or school change.[20]

The school focused INSET activities include staff conferences, and follow-up activities, staff development programs and consultancy visits. Characteristically, such activities would:

a. Vary considerably in length but rarely extend beyond one year;

b. Be mainly school-based but sometimes take place off-site at another school or a teachers' center, etc.;

c. Be staffed by teachers from the school and by external advisors and invited contributors or consultants;

d. Be initiated, and often designed, by the school in the light of school and group policies;

e. Be attended by individuals, groups, or the whole staff from the school and sometimes by outsiders;

f. Be aimed at the group and the whole staff (i.e. system) development needs of the school;

g. Sometimes, but not usually, take place in the classroom, or some other on-the-job or job-embedded context;

h. Concentrate on practical knowledge and skills of a job-specific and problem solving kind;

i. Use experience-based "teaching" methods like job rotation, classroom observation by peers, visits to other schools and organization development, as well as lectures, discussions, films, etc.;

j. Only rarely lead to any kind of award, accreditation, salary increase or promotion;

k. Normally involve follow-up work as an integral part of the activity; and

l. Sometimes be formally evaluated by school staff for impact upon teaching performance and school change."

Having examined the school's role in in-service education in the United Kingdom, with the emphasis of the different kinds of programs introduced by the local authorities, whether long or short courses/programs, it is important here to examine the role played by the teacher centers in the United Kingdom, concerning the same issue.

Teachers' Centers in the United Kingdom

British Teachers' Centers follow no set pattern and the precise number of them is difficult to assess. The School's Council reckoned there were 544 in April 1977. The School's Council for Curriculum and Examinations, set up in 1964 as a national body with majority of teachers on its governing council and main committees, encouraged the setting up of local teacher centers. In Working Paper No. 10, it was suggested that centers should be established

"to give teachers a setting within which new objectives can be discussed and defined, and new ideas on content and methods in a variety of subjects can be aired...to contribute to the evaluation of materials before they are published and to feed back comments, criticisms and suggestions for improvement...[to keep teachers] informed about research and development in progress [so that]

> they can prepare themselves to appraise and modify, according to their own estimation of individual and local need, the materials which may eventually become generally available."[28]

Toward the end of the Working Paper, a statement, important to both the history of the development of Teachers' Centers and to an understanding of their present stage of development, urged that:

> "...the native power should come primarily from local groups of teachers accessible to one another; [and] that there should be effective and close collaboration between teachers and all those who are able to offer close collaboration...that is, the support serviced of Advisors, Inspectorate, and institutions of initial training."[29]

The variety of Teachers' Centers found in United Kingdom is a function of the great diversity of structural patterns adopted by local education authorities. For example, one local education authority (LEA) in the Southeast of England, with a population of 1.25 million, has set up nine Centers. These are located either in small, redundant schools, colleges of further education and youth centers; or in suitable rooms made available in schools themselves. In most cases, there is a comfortable lounge, work room, small library, and audio-visual resource area. Eight of the nine centers have a part-time warden, a practicing teacher who spends half of his/her day in a school with a specific teaching commitment, the other half both visiting other schools in his/her area (finding out what teachers want) and in the center arranging programs, organizing courses, and possibly leading discussion and development groups. The ninth center has not yet employed a warden. This is because, in his authority, the general policy has been to leave a committee of local teachers to start things off, usually in temporary accommodation, and if the need arises, then to step in and provide more permanent premises and staff.

A second LEA, with a population of around half a million, has five centers. One of them is newly purpose-built on the campus of a large (over 2000 pupils) secondary school; the others are located in premises conveniently vacated and adaptable. Here, the wardens are full-time appointments to the centers and have considerable status and freedom to do what they asses the teachers want and need.

A third LEA, population just over one million, has a much more coordinated organization. Its eleven centers are a combination of specialist centers (for example, in educational technology) and general centers. The wardens, often head teachers of primary schools, are head of departments in secondary schools, are full-time teachers and run their centers after school for which they are paid extra. This authority has a schools council of its own, modelled on the now defunct national Schools Council, and makes available to all its schools the termly programs of what is happening in every center in the county.

During its existence, the national Schools Council had no authority whatsoever over teachers and does not want it, but rather engages in

stimulating and encouraging local development of Teachers' Centers and curriculum development in Britain in general.[30]

In the late seventies, calls for the reform of the Council, and even for its total abolition emanated from both Labor and Conservative parties. At the time, this was regarded as a measure of the success of the Council in initiating and providing a forum and framework for grassroots and public discussion of educational issues. However, these calls presaged the eventual demise of the Schools' Council. The decline of the Council and the general contraction in the U.K. educational system during this period had a deleterious effect on the Teachers' Centers movement. So, much of the future work of Teachers' Centers depends on both a move toward school based in-service education and money being made available for in-service training activities.[31]

These general and broad ideas about the Teachers' Centers in the United Kingdom will be compared with the Teachers' Centers in the United States in the following pages, and will be ready for the Egyptian experience to be used and benefitted from according to their societal conditions.

School-Based In-Service Education in the United States

Some American experience is relevant here. Describing some research directed at in-service education, Rubin (1964) concluded:

> "it was our belief that a school centered approach to professional growth would necessitate an on-site agent, someone able to manage the program of self-developments. Moreover, we felt, on the basis of previous work, that the school principal could not serve this function. The need to achieve stability amidst change normally presents the building administrator with a difficult role conflict. Moreover, experience has led as to suspect that one person cannot proficiently serve as the permanent changemaster in a school. Consequently, in our study, a teacher selected by his faculty colleagues and given special leadership training, was used as the training agent. The results were extremely impressive; in fact, that we now conjecture that a practicing teacher is the best possible trainer of teachers."[32]

Rubin and Howey (1976) gave examples of similar developments include the introduction of school-based teacher educators in Houston, United States,[33] and the proposals for a specific personnel function and in-service plans within Dutch Secondary schools.[34]

Other examples of school-focused INSET display features of a more centralized or managerial kind. The Montgomery County staff government program, for instance, is a district level scheme which is based upon specific performance expectations for each teacher, and the Lincoln district uses a variant on management by objectives for its staff appraisal and development scheme.[35]

A particular study was made of the actual and potential contribution of Teachers' Centers to school-focused INSET in California.[٣٥] As Howey rightly observes in his synthesis report, there is considerable diversity not only between countries and cultures, but within countries in terms of those structures and operations which are referred to as Teachers' Centers. He goes on to argue that:

> "while many Teacher Centers are school-focused in nature, others are not. It is difficult to generalize, but the differences between some Teachers' Centers and other forms of in-service which are specifically school-focused would include the following:
>
> 1. The primary focus in most Teacher Centers quite obviously is on teachers; while many school-focused in-service endeavors tend to attend to the needs of all educational and educational-related personnel in a school building.
>
> 2. The focus in many Teachers' Centers tend to be more on individual teacher needs and interests, while in many school-focused endeavors, there is at least some attention to problems which are best attended to by the entire faculty or close working groups within that faculty.
>
> 3. Many Teachers' Centers have a district or regional focus; they attend to the needs of a number of schools. Other forms of school-focused in-service concentrate their energies more directly on individual schools.
>
> 4. There is an effort in many Teachers' Centers to develop better linkages and coordination between and among the plethora of agents and agencies which are to some extent involved in the continuing education of teachers. In other forms of school-focused in-service, a variety of persons external to the school are called upon, but the primary goal is to attend to the needs of the individual school and not serve as a coordinating agency."[٣٦]

However, it would be a good idea to examine Teachers' Centers in the United States in full detail.

Teachers' Centers in the United States

Over the past ten years, a nationwide group of American educators have developed the idea of a small, informal, sometimes independent, sometimes school district sponsored work places where elementary teachers come on their own initiative, to work on curriculum for their own classrooms. They work with the help of practical-minded professors or master teachers and with each other, largely in the spirit of colleagues exchanging rather than experts training.

Such programs are places where teachers come to work together, receive instruction, or share self-instruction. But they also may be a staff of

advisors, who go out to help teachers in their schools, working in the spirit of finding teachers' own starting points for improvement. A number of characteristics make these organizations different from conventional programs:

1. They offer teachers fresh curriculum materials and/or lesson ideas, emphasizing active, exploratory, frequently individualized classroom work—not textbook or workbook study.

2. These programs engage teachers in making their own curriculum materials, building classroom apparatus, or involve them in some entirely new learning pursuit of their own so as to reacquaint them with the experience of being active, exploratory learners themselves.

3. Teachers' Center instructors are themselves classroom teachers, sharing their own practical, classroom developed materials; or they are advisors—formally classroom teachers—who view their job as stimulating, supporting, and extending a teacher in his/her own directions of growth, not implementing a new instructional model or strategy.

4. Attendance at Teachers' Center classes is voluntary—not prescribed by the school district—or if indirectly required (for instance, as a way to spend release time or to earn advancement credits), programs offered are based on teachers' expressions of their own training needs and several choices are offered.[38]

Small In-service programs of this type for elementary school teachers grow up almost spontaneously in locations in all parts of the United States because of the pressures upon elementary school teachers to refresh or even re-learn their changes in schooling: the change in the curriculum with diminution of reliance on textbooks, workbooks and lecture, and increase of variety in subject matter, learning style and learning pace; and the changes in the classroom population as a result of racial desegregation.

Teachers' Center practice is at a crossroads in the United States. The practice to be initiated under the new federal funding has not emerged, and the prospects for the existing, experienced Centers to survive and develop are unclear. School funds (allocated from local property taxes), are being cut back in almost every locality; yet school people see no reduction in the instructional and social problems pupils bring to the classroom. State and federal governments increasingly attempt to assist local school districts, but there is disagreement as to whether these financial resources should flow with strings attached, mandating particular instructional strategies and programs, or whether local education agencies should use the state and federal money at their own discretion.

The new federal Teachers' Center program is one of those fashioned to assist local schools, and it mandates local discretion in the design of

Centers--such discretion to be exercised by each Center having a policy board made up of local teachers and citizens, with teachers in the majority. In the concern about democratic procedures for selecting representative policy boards it will be unfortunate if teachers overlook the need to choose board members who exemplify commitment to their own professional growth as teachers. In order to create and oversee a Teachers' Center, something more is needed than a majority of properly representative teachers acting independently from the school administration. They must act wisely. What is learned is a Teachers' Center--as distinguished as what is taught--is largely controlled by what the participant teachers bring to the center. They bring their own time, ingenuity, perseverance, their own teaching successes to build on and share; their willingness to risk learning something new and to pinpoint areas for their improvement. Teachers who evidence previous investment of this kind in their own professional growth or local curriculum development are needed on the Center's policy board. Only that depth of experience can both generate an innovative program and verify its relevance to co-workers.

Another challenge for the implementation of the new Teachers' Center legislation in the U.S. is the necessity to broaden the base of teachers participating in the Center. Most of the experience with Centers has been gained by educators who hold an in-service concept of teachers' professional growth rather than the social district's "delivery of skills."

However, many educators are confident that teacher participation can be broadened by making it possible for teachers to attend during the work day. Therefore, providing substitutes to take the place of teachers released from the classroom to work in the Teachers' Center is an expense that few local school boards seem likely to authorize at a time of declining budgets.[9]

Howey, in his synthesis report within the International Survey (1986), argues that there is little doubt that Teachers' Centers have contributed to in-service practice which is frequently school focused in nature. The following eight characteristics might distinguish the forms of Teachers' Centers in the U.S.:

1. They are often governed collaboratively with greater amounts of input from classroom teachers than is typically found in a non-teacher center program.

2. They usually have a 'place,' sometimes an entire building, but often a group of rooms where training and materials development can occur.

3. Teachers are clearly the primary clients, although other types of education personnel often participate.

4. They are devised to serve institutional needs as well as individual needs, and in rare occasions even both.

5. Programs typically emphasize the improvement of teaching skills and the development of curriculum materials.

6. There appears to be a tendency for less informal instruction with the sharing of participant expertise occurring frequently (although there can be considerable input from outside consultants as well).

7. Persons responsible for Teachers' Centers are usually motivated and possess a recognizable level of expertise.

8. Funding is often tentative and short-range teacher centers frequently live from hand-to-mouth, day to day.[40]

Moreover, given the diversity of Teachers' Centers referred to above, it may well be more productive to concentrate on identifying effective roles and strategies for school-focused INSET by analyzing examples of good practice, wherever these occur, and then disseminating descriptions as well as possible so that providing agencies of all types can adopt and adapt these methods where appropriate.

In the following pages, the study would like to show practical examples from these Teachers' Centers in the United States in the State of Pennsylvania. All three centers described below have been developed in the Pittsburgh Public Schools, though teachers from nearby districts participate in the programs on an inter-district basis. These centers represent different school levels.

Brookline Elementary Teachers' Center[41]

This Center opened its doors in August of 1985. Teachers visiting the center have the opportunity to experience professional revitalization during a five-week program.

The center's program has three basic objectives:

1. To demonstrate state-of-the-art instructional curriculum and school organizational practices.

2. To revitalize teachers' subject knowledge, instructional skills and professional attitudes.

3. To develop effective instructional leadership.

Visiting teachers experience a three-phase process:

Phase One: Orientation and self-assessment occur at the visiting teachers' home school. An interviewer from the center presents to the visiting teacher the options available at the center. Collectively they develop goals and select experiences necessary for goal achievement. This self-assessment will be used in developing a five week plan at the center.

Phase Two: Direct involvement entails a five week experience at the center. The visiting teacher experiences the following main activities in

phase two: refinement of instructional skills, content area update, seminars on child development, training seminars in School District initiatives, and professional growth and development seminars. Visiting teachers review their goals at the completion of phase two.

Phase Three: Follow-Through involves returning to home school and applying knowledge gained through the staff development program. During this phase, the principal will continue to work closely with the teacher.

There are approximately 600 students at the Teacher Center with a variety of cultural and economic backgrounds. The Teacher Center program is organized both to develop staff and, more importantly, to satisfy the diverse educational needs of children. The resident staff is divided into three groups:

1. Clinical Teachers, who take a leadership role in working with visiting teachers to improve their teaching skills.

2. Development Demonstration Teachers who demonstrate specific state-of-the-art instructional curriculum innovation; and

3. Replacement Teachers who replace the visiting teachers after much collaborative planning.

The resident teaching staff has the responsibility of modeling the highest levels of instructional competence.

The roles played by each group, a description of the program, the sources of funding, and a description of how feedback is used to refine and amend the development plan are described in full detail in Appendix 1.

Greenway Middle School Teachers' Center[42]

Through its unique programming, the Greenway Middle Teachers' Center seeks to improve the quality of teaching in all the district's 15 middle schools, it:

1. Serves as the "model" middle school effectively delivering a unique program specifically geared to the unique needs of the transient child (ages 11-14) and establishing the bond between elementary and high school years.

2. Functions as a special staff development center to assist middle school educators in refining the skills needed to teach transient youth. Teachers participate in specific classroom and clinical experiences designed to increase their skill levels in such areas as:

   a. Increasing the knowledge and application of effective teaching skills, as defined by the Pittsburgh Research-based Instructional Supervisory Model (PRISM).

b. Increasing knowledge of the characteristics and needs of the middle school child and the implications for classroom instruction.

c. Increasing each participant's repertoire of teaching strategies and classroom management techniques.

d. Providing curriculum and content updates.

3. Acts as a clearing house and pilot center for new and innovative middle school programs before they are introduced on a system wide basis.

4. Plans, implements, and monitors the involvement of parents, visitors, and community institutions in the Center's program in order to promote community acceptance of and participation in the middle school program.

5. Provides opportunities for externship experiences at area universities, within the community, at other school sites, and at business and industrial workplaces.

6. Follows through with participants--after they return to their home schools--to monitor and assist them in applying the Teachers' Center experience in their home classrooms.

Since middle school teachers are organized at their home schools into interdisciplinary teaching teams, members of each team attend the center together. During each cycle, approximately 20 teachers are selected from middle schools throughout the district to spend "mini-sabbaticals for five weeks" as visiting teachers at Greenway. Each is assigned to a Clinical Resident Teacher, who assists in planning individualized center experiences and acts as a clinical observer and critic for the visitor's teaching skills and actions. Other teachers on the Greenway staff serve as Developmental Demonstration Teachers, who model effective teaching strategies in various content areas. Replacement teachers are employed to teach the students of visiting teachers while the latter attend to the center's staff development program.

The Teacher Center program is conducted in three phases:

Phase One: Orientation and assessment is conducted at the home school. This includes development of preliminary Personal Action Plan establishing individual goals to be accomplished during the Center stay.

Phase Two: Direct involvement includes attendance of workshops, seminars, and instruction in the PRISM, Effective Teaching Skills Model, classroom demonstration and practice, teaching clinics, externships, and interdisciplinary team projects.

Phase Three: Follow-Through involves continuing contact with the visiting teachers after their return to the home classroom to encourage implementation of the project planned at the center and development of other interdisciplinary teaching units, to assist with the planning and implementation of in-service workshops for other home school teachers; and to offer peer observation and feedback.

A list of responsibilities of each group of teachers involved in the Teachers' Center program, the interview assessment form, the guidelines for externships, the personal action plan, the follow-through plan, and the time-table of the five week program are included in Appendix 2.

Schenley High School Teachers' Center[43]

This center opened in September, 1983, after a full 18 months of development in which over 200 of the district's secondary teachers, supervisors, and administrators participated. Teachers in cohorts (groups) of 50 from the district's other 11 secondary schools visited the center for eight weeks during which they participated in structured experiences to refine and expand their instructional skills, increase their sensitivity to adolescent development, update their professional content knowledge, renew themselves both personally and professionally, and follow through on the experience at their home school.

The center was designed to encourage the improvement of teaching as a profession through peer observation of instruction and attendance at seminars and workshops on adolescent development conducted by both center resident teachers and outside experts. Further, sessions were offered around subject area content knowledge designed and conducted by the district's staff development team.

This experience proceeds through three phases:

Phase One: Orientation and self-assessment occurs at the home school. During orientation, members of the Teachers' Center staff visit with the variety of options available at the center. The teacher reviews the goals and experiences he feels are required for continued professional growth. The self-assessment is facilitated by teacher's principal in cooperation with the center's coordinator whose responsibility is to serve as liaison between the teacher's home school and the center. This self-assessment forms the basis for the teacher's development of his individual plan which he designs upon arrival at the center.

Phase Two: Direct involvement occurs at the center over an eight-week period. During the first two weeks of the cycle, teachers receive training in PRISM (Pittsburgh Research-based Instructional Supervisory Model). This model is based on research of good teaching and instructional strategies which should be used to provide the student with every opportunity to learn. They practice these effective teaching techniques in small group sessions with their peers. High school teachers, for the first time in many years, have an opportunity to look closely at the profession and exchange views about teaching with their colleagues. Also during the first two weeks,

introductory sessions on adolescent development are conducted by a clinical psychologist and content area orientations are conducted by subject specialists.

During the next six weeks of the cycle, teachers decide how they will divide their time among four areas. They can choose from over twenty seminars on areas related to adolescent development. These seminars include not only readings on the topic, but also a follow-up activity which teachers take part.

The second area involves reviewing and updating content area knowledge. It calls for participation in over 35 hours of experiences related to the teacher's content area as well as other subjects. These experiences, designed by the content area specialists, address both current curriculum trends in the district as well as those of the future. They span a broad range from computer literacy for educators to learning styles of learning disabled students and forces teachers on the important areas of testing, questioning, and critical thinking.

Teachers may select seminars related to their own personal and professional enrichment. Many choose sessions on adult developmental stages or stress management. They might decide to develop an individual project in cooperation with the director and spend a week pursuing a professional goal they always had but for which time has not been available.

Most importantly and central to the experience, they work cooperatively with a clinical resident teacher in the refinement and expansion of their instructional skills. This model, based on PRISM, calls for a clinical resident teacher and two visiting teachers to work collegially to refine the instructional process. Visiting teachers learn and practice new skills and techniques and receive feedback from the residential staff. To intensify this model, each visiting teacher may take part in up to two teaching clinics, a group observation, analysis, and conference led by a specially trained clinical resident teacher.

Phase Three: Follow-Through: the end of the 8-week experience, teachers review their goals and enter the third phase of the program, Follow-Through. They return to their home school to apply the newly acquired skills and knowledge. The teacher continues to receive support from the principal, who, as the instructional leader, provides feedback in all aspects of instructional process. The School-Center coordinator takes an active role in implanting the center experience into the visiting teacher's home classroom.

The Teachers' Center is organized to accommodate not only the program for visiting teachers, but also, most importantly, for the 900 students, grades 9 through 12 who enter its doors each day. Schenley students are typical of urban students across the nation. These students are involved in the general curriculum offered at other high schools in the district. In

addition, students at the center may enroll in one of three magnet programs: High Technology, International Studies, or Health Careers.

Schenley High School Students are instructed by the resident teachers who were chosen from among applicants and recruits from across the district. These applicants had to satisfy a variety of criteria, one of which was their ability to effect student achievement. Once selected, they received and continue to receive training in all aspects of the instructional model. A center of 48 teachers on the staff are called replacement teachers. These teachers are responsible for the instruction of the students of visiting teachers while they are at the center.

Administration of the center is under the direction of the principal who is responsible for all programs within the center. The director works cooperatively with the principal and is responsible for the on-going program for visiting teachers.

However, the Schenley High School Teachers' Center, the only program of its kind in the United States, is now recognized as an ambitious, dynamic, evolving, and significant reply to the many national concerns about the education of today's teenagers. It demonstrates that one school district can meet and exceed the demands for excellence in its schools by having teachers update their skills and return to the classroom revitalized to teach.

The District Strategies for Building and Sustaining Change in the Professional Culture of Secondary Schools, including the background of the Schenley High School Center, the program overview, the center of excellence concept, and the application forms of observation and monthly summary report are included in appendix 3.

A Comparative Perspective:

Drawing on these observations of in-service education within schools in both the United Kingdom and the United States of America (mainly in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania), the following lessons can be learned:

1. The in-service programs may be divided into two broad and overlapping categories. First, those courses which have implications mainly for the development of the individual teacher's skills and resources which do not involve directly any other teacher or the general policy of the school. Second, those courses which imply decision-making involving more than one teacher and which may have major implications for the policy of the school as a whole. Those courses whose content cannot be applied to an individual teaching situation defined only by one teacher. Courses on integrated studies, mixed ability teaching and compensatory education, for example, must be shared if they are to be effective.

2. The study agreed with the argument that claimed that we can no longer expect the period of initial training to equip a new member of the profession for all he is likely to encounter in the rapidly changing educational scene.[4] Therefore, schools must encourage adaptability and a

willingness to retrain. There is still an unfortunate tendancy among some teachers to regard those who attend in-service education courses [illegible]erely promotion. Although promotion is, of course, a perfectly proper incentive to professional development, the mistake is to see attendance on in-service courses only is invested in career progress and not as a response to a particular professional need. It could be that one of the reasons why some regard in-service education in this respect is because they feel it has manifestly failed to engage with real problems experienced in the real teaching situations.

3. School-based in-service training sessions learning within one's own teaching environment would do much to help encourage more teachers--and more heads--to adopt a more positive attitude to regearing and revitalizing teaching techniques.

4. In-service education is an important process of planned change in the educational institutions, whether personal changes or development, which is everyone's job within the school.

5. There are a number of important factors for the in-service education within schools as a result of the cultural change, social change, pupil enrollment, number of teachers required, school leader's style, and the knowledge and subject matter requirements.

6. In-service education can take place in two ways, such as in long and/or short courses, as existed in the case of the United Kingdom.

7. In both cases, the in-service education programs became the main responsibility of the Teachers' Center. The British Teachers' Centers follow no set pattern according to their function and the diversity of their structural patterns adopted by local education authorities. Meanwhile, there are many similarities between the Teachers' Centers in the U.S. case, because of their certification of goals and objectives, and the power held by the Teachers' Union who are supporting this idea as well as the school board.

8. There are more details provided in the case of the United States than the case of the United Kingdom, concerning: training programs and their goals and objectives; the teachers attendance and the relationships between the local education authority within the district and the Teachers' Center.

9. There are more resources of financial support for the Teachers' Center in the U.S. than in England, which is ineffective for its varieties of training programs.

Having examined these two cases of countries, this study would expect that it was possible to be able to answer the second, third, and fourth questions which have been raised by this study.

In the following paragraph, the answer to the fifth question, which is dealing with the Egyptian benefits from these two cases, will be addressed.

Possible Benefits for Egyptian Schools

Although the Ministry of Education in Egypt still adheres to the policy line it made with regard to the need for preparation of teachers of all levels, with its varieties of general, technical and teacher education at one source, so that they are all pedagogically-qualified at university level; this study still holds the position that the initial period of training (pre-service) is not enough to equip those new members of the profession for all they are likely to encounter in the rapidly changing educational environmental aspects.

Furthermore, despite the Ministry of Education's efforts to organize in-service training programs at the central level and at the level of educational directorates, there is a real need for school-based programs for forming teachers of the various disciplines in all stages to help improve the quality of their performance, and to keep them abreast of the nature of curricular programs and textbook content changes.

These programs of in-service education normally designed by the Head quarter of Teaching Training Centers in Egypt which are--according to the available sources--seven centers to serve 26 Governates with its several educational administrations and dictorates, with a total of 22,660 schools, 263,073 classes and 11,106,389 students.

The final decision about in-service education programs, however, has been taking on the central levels without any contact with those interested people (teachers) to meet their demands and professional requirements, leading to carelessness or absence of these programs.

For how long will this way last in Egypt? The current study expects too long; and this will harm the Egyptian system of education as a whole. Therefore, this study provides lessons from the two experiences of the United Kingdom and the United States of America, taking into consideration the specific initial condition of the Egyptian society at the time being and in the future. What can we learn from this comparative study?

First, based on this study, the author believes that Egypt has the most imported resources in respect of human resources, whether teachers, engineers, doctors, economists, etc. The teaching forced out of these specialists is a large and most important one in reality, although not in the socio-economic status. To raise the socio-economic status by raising their salary and promotion only is not enough, despite the fact that it is very important. Thus, another aspect which is more important politically, economically, socially, and spiritually is to change their attitudes toward their career.

Second, out of those thousands of teachers (more than 500,000), a good percentage believe in their career. Some are working, and some of them are already in retirement. These are the people whom we should depend on to create such Teachers' Centers within their schools so that they're available to other colleagues in order to exchange their ideas and experiences, and also to learn what they are interested in within the teaching environment:

not in other places like the Educational Directorate or other schools where there is neither authority nor contact between those people who organize and design the in-service programs and the participants from the teachers.

Third, with the economic situation and the social situation together, it might cause some some shortages or some contradictions. But the study suggests to start gradually by an alternative way of doing that. For example, most of the administrative and professional leaders recognize that the 18,000 science teachers and 16,500 mathematics teachers represent a surplus over the Egyptian school requirements. Still, some weaknesses among teachers in these two fields exist. For this reason, the Educational Authority in Egypt may choose some schools as Teachers' Centers and employ those excellent, full-experienced and skillful teachers for these centers, and then invite other teachers to visit the centers and allow those experts to visit schools to talk to their colleagues about their needs and requirements. In this way, they could share their programs within these centers.

For the other subjects which might have some shortages, such as languages and technical subjects, there is a huge number of retired whom are rich in experience and skill, and who are also willing to provide services and advice to their colleagues with no charge, except to give them the will to live. So, this way it might solve some social aspects as well as the economic one.

Fourth, according to the shortages of school buildings, these suggested Teachers' Centers should be located within existing schools. The experts must have a teaching load to be involved in the real teaching environment, but not the same load as other teachers having no mentoring responsibilities.

Fifth, these Teachers' Centers should provide an in-service program for the whole year. Each program depends on its length and aims on the participating teachers' (participant) preferences and the experts' assessment based on their school visits and meetings with their peers. Also, these centers differ according to the level of education (basic education, general secondary education or technical secondary education).

Sixth, these Teachers' Centers should be in very close cooperation with the University College of Education, to benefit from them new ideas, and to be aware of the nature and the context of the pre-service program of teacher education. Also, to be in good relation with the educational authority helps with decision making in particular, and with other educational organizations, these which should take care of the professional development such as the Ministry of Education, Educational Directorate and the Teacher's Union.

Seventh, these Teachers' Centers should be in contact with both the internal as well as the external environment, particularly with parents and the association, political organization, economic organization, commercial, social and other community groups.

REFERENCES AND FOOTNOTES

1. The author would like to express his sincere appreciation to Professor Mark Ginsburg, Director of Institute For International Studies In Education, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh, who provided constructive and helpful editorial assistance through the whole work of this study. Also, he would like to thank Lesah Johnson and Donalda Booker who helped in typing this paper.

2. The Holmes Group, "Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group," (East Lansing: Michigan State University,1986), in Donald Warren (Editor), American Teachers: Histories of a Profession at Work, Macmillan Publishing Company, New York, 1989, p. 213.

3. Perry, P., Final Conclusions of the Stockholm Conference on Strategies for School-Focused Support Structure for Teachers in Change and Innovation, OECD, Paris, 1977, pp. 2-3.

4. Development of Education in the Arab Republic of Egypt (1984/86), National Center for Educational Research, Cairo, 1986, p. 128.

5. Ibid., p. 5.

6. Ibid., p. 83.

7. Haggag, A.F.A., "Coping with the Future: The Case of Educational Reform in Egypt," Paper presented to the Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES), Educational Reform in International Perspective, Anaheim, California, U.S.A., March 22-25, 1990, pp. 14-15.

8. Dahawy, B.M., "Policy solutions for Teacher Education in Egypt: A Comparative Perspective," Paper presented to the Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES), Educational Reform in International Perspective, Anaheim, California, U.S.A., March 22-25, 1990, pp.1-2.

See also:
Dahawy, B.M., "Training Teacher for Adult Education in Egypt: Analytical Comparative Study," The First Scientific Conference for Developing and Preparing Curriculum, The Egyptian Society of Curriculum and Instruction, Ismailia, Egypt, January 15-18, 1989, pp. 839-878.

Dahawy, B.M., "Teacher Education in Japan and Republic of China: A Comparative Study," Education in Egypt: Second Conference, Teacher Education, Ismailia, Egypt, December 2-4, 1989, pp. 135-151.

El-Shikhaby, A., and Dahawy, B.M., "Teachers Point View of the Leadership Style of School Head Master: An Empirical Study," The

Annual Conference of the Scientific Center of Statistics (The Education and Social Science Division), Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt, March 1990.

9. The Second Cycle Teacher, The Final Report, Faculty of Education, Ain-Shams University with cooperation with the Ministry of Education and the World Bank, Cairo, Egypt, December 1979.

See also:
The Arab League of Education, Culture, and Science, Preparing and Training the Arab Teachers Conference, Cairo, Egypt, January 8-17, 1972.

10. Bereday, G.Z.E., Comparative Method in Education, Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York, 1964, pp. 20-28.

11. Dahawy, B.M., "Training Teacher for Adult Education in Egypt: Analytical Comparative Study," op. cit., pp. 844-848.

12. Harris, B.M., Bessent, W., and McIntyre, K.E., In-Service Education: A Guide To Better Practice, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, U.S.A., 1969, pp. 1-2.

13. Ibid., p. 16.

14. Ibid., pp. 26-

15. Ibid., pp. 3-4.

16. Corey, S.M., "Introduction," In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, The Fifty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part One, ed. by Henry, N.B., Distributed by the University of Chicago Press, U.S.A., 1957, p. 1.

17. Ibid., p. 2.

18. Hass, C.G., "In-Service Education Today," In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, Ibid., pp. 13-25.

19. Paker, J.C., "Guidelines for In-Service Education," In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrators, Ibid., pp. 104-124.

20. Center for Educational Research and Innovation," In-Service Education and Training of Teachers: A Condition for Educational Change, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Paris 1982, p. 20.

21. Department of Education and Science, Making INSET Work, DES, London, 1978, pp. A-B.

22. Bolam, R., Baker, K., and McMahon, A., "Teacher Induction Pilot Schemes: Final National Evaluation Report," University of Bristol, School of Education, U.K., 1979, p. 22.

23. Center for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI), In-Service Education and Training of Teachers, op. cit., p. 22.

24. Department of Education and Science, Making INSET Work, OECD, op. cit., p. C.

25. Bolam, R., "Final Report," In-Service Training and Educational Development: An International Survey, ed. by David Hopkins, Croom Helm, London, 1986, 1986, pp. 30-31.

26. Ibid., pp. 31-33.

27. Ibid., pp. 33-34.

28. Griggs, A., and Gregory, J., "Teacher Centers in the United Kingdom," In-Service Training and Educational Development: An International Study, ed. by David Hopkins, Croom Helm, London, 1986, p. 83.

29. Ibid., p. 84.

30. Ibid., pp. 84-85.

31. Ibid., p. 85.

32. Rubin, L.J., A Study of Teacher Retraining, University of California Center for Coordinated Education, U.S.A., 1969, pp. 86-87.

33. Rubin, J., and Howey, K., Innovation in INSET: United States, OECD, Paris, 1976, p. 22.

34. Van Velzen, W. (ed.), Developing an Autonomous School, The Hague: Dutch Catholic School Council, 1979, in Rubin and Howey, op. cit., p. 22.

35. Howey, K., "Cultural Perspectives and Evoking Trends in In-Service Education in the United States" in Rubin and Howey, Ibid., pp. 22-23.

36. Birdsall, L., Gordon, D. W., and Bond, L. G., A Framework for Building Effective Comprehensive School Improvement and Staff Development Programs: A Process Model, Sacramento, California State Department of Education, U.S.A., 1978, p. 22.

37. Howey, K., School-Focused In-Service Education: Clarification of a New Concept and Strategy, Synthesis Report, OECD Publications, 1980.

See also:
Hopkins, D., In-Service Training Education Development, An International Survey, Croom Helm, London, 1986, pp. 86-87.

38. Devaney, K., "Teacher Centers in the United States, Fare West Laboratory, San Francisco, In-Service Training and Educational Development: An International Survey, Ibid., pp. 86-87.

39. Ibid., pp. 88-89.

40. Howey, K., School-Focused In-Service Education: Synthesis Report, OECD, op. cit., p. 73.

41. For more information, contact Brookline Elementary Teacher Center, Pioneer and Woodbourne Avenues, Pittsburgh, PA 15226, U.S.A., Tel: (412) 571-7480.

42. For more information, contact: Greenway Middle School Teacher Center, 1400 Crucible Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15205, U.S.A., Tel: (412) 928-2800/6580.

43. For more information, contact: Schenley High School Teacher Center, Bigelow Boulevard and Centre Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, U.S.A., Tel: (412) 622-8480.

44. Watkins, R., "The Role of the School in In-Service Training," In-Service Training: Structure and Content, World Lock Educational, London, 1973, pp. 82-83.

45. Pre-Education University Statistics 1988/1989, National Center for Educatonal Research and Development (Statistics, Information, and Computer: M.O.E.), Cairo, Egypt, 1989.